



STATE OF WASHINGTON

**OFFICE OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT**

*Insurance Building, PO Box 43113 • Olympia, Washington 98504-3113 • (360) 902-0555*

June 11, 2004

**TO:** Laura Eckert Johnson, Director  
Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation

**FROM:** Marty Brown, Director *MB*

**SUBJECT: ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR AGENCY BUDGET SUBMITTALS**

The Priorities of Government (POG) Results Teams recently completed work on the high-level purchase strategies that they believe will best achieve statewide results. As part of this effort, Teams also made suggestions about specific analyses and initiatives that will help them in the fall when they reconvene to produce detailed purchase plans for implementation of proposed strategies. Because Results Teams will be reviewing agency budget requests for activities that can be included in these purchase plans, we are communicating their ideas to you as you prepare your budgets.

Although the state is not facing quite the same fiscal challenges that generated the initial Priorities of Government process in 2002, initial estimates for 2005-07 indicate a \$700 million shortfall between forecasted state General Fund (GFS) revenues and the cost of continuing current GFS-funded services. The POG budget approach helps us focus on core services that contribute the most toward statewide results. This, in turn, provides a framework for OFM decisions and budget recommendations to the Governor.

**High-Level Strategies will Guide Budget Decisions**

We strongly urge your consideration of the information contained in this memo as you develop your agency budget proposal.

1. You will find enclosed a list of the high-level indicators of success and the purchase strategies recommended for each statewide result. This information is the investment criteria that Results Teams will use to create their purchase recommendations. Review the indicators and strategies for all 11 results and focus on areas that you believe can be influenced with activities in your agency. For example, if your budget includes activities that affect indicators in Result #4 (Improve Health) because they contribute to the statewide strategy of "mitigating environmental hazards," then your budget should help make that connection for the Results Team.

A summary is provided in this memo, but we encourage you to read the full reports of the Teams, particularly those prepared for Tollgate #2, to understand the context in which these recommendations were made. The reports are available at <http://www.ofm.wa.gov/budget/pog/teamreports.htm>.

2. For some agencies, there are recommended initiatives or research projects listed at the end of this memo. This means one or more Results Teams indicated interest in these ideas and are asking for additional information before they complete their purchase plan recommendation in the fall.
3. The Teams also suggested criteria that agencies could use to assess the activities they propose for funding. As you determine your budget request, we recommend you address these questions in your deliberations:
  - Are there options for earlier, preventative interventions as alternatives to more expensive services later?
  - Are those options evidence-based or supported by research as to their effectiveness toward the intended result?
  - Are we paying the right price for the services delivered?
  - Are activities properly coordinated for maximum effect?
  - Do activities have explicit outcomes and measures of performance?
  - Are there opportunities for outcome-based contracts?

### **Additional Information Requested for the Budget Submittal**

OFM has selected a number of the recommendations mentioned in the team reports to be completed as part of the budget development process. We ask that your agency submit the following information, either as part of your budget request, as an addendum to your budget submittal, or as a separate submittal on the date indicated.

1. The Department of Natural Resources and the State Parks and Recreation Commission, convened by the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation, should develop a timeline, project outline, site-selection process with criteria, and budget request to implement the research and design phase of a pilot program to co-manage DNR recreation sites with high visitation rates and that have high potential for co-management, fee-based recreation, and revenue generation. The Department of Fish and Wildlife should be included in the initial planning stages to determine whether similar co-management opportunities exist on its lands.
2. Statutory restrictions on the Off-Road Vehicle (ORV) and Non-Highway and Off-Road Vehicle Account (NOVA) prevent their use for maintaining certain DNR recreation sites. IAC and DNR should re-examine these restrictions to determine if they are still valid, given the current uses of those sites, and, if appropriate, develop proposed legislation.
3. Submit analysis, after consultation with local parks officials and OFM, on whether changes to the state's statutes governing the creation of metropolitan park districts (MPDs) have resulted in the creation of additional MPDs, and whether this mechanism has been helpful for keeping local facilities open and maintained to standard. Please also work with local government associations to quantify the number of locally operated recreational facilities and resources with closed or reduced hours, and identify any significant gaps in service that have resulted.
4. The Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation, in coordination with the Department of Ecology, the Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Department of Natural Resources and the Conservation Commission, should develop a proposal to better coordinate and achieve efficiencies in monitoring data collection, systems and public access to this data.

June 11, 2004

Page 3

5. The Office of Financial Management, in coordination with the Salmon Recovery Funding Board, the Department of Ecology and the Department of Fish and Wildlife, should propose options to coordinate the implementation of Watershed Plans and Regional Salmon Recovery Plans. As these plans are completed, developing mechanisms to implement these plans is the next step. The use of mitigation funds should be explored as a way of funding implementation of these plans as well as ways to coordinate and align other natural resource grant programs to better achieve results.
6. The Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development should submit a proposal to reduce the cost of making grants and loans for local infrastructure. Consider using a “foundation” type of structure where requests for infrastructure funding from the state would come through a single process. The Department should work with the Department of Ecology, the Department of Transportation, the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation, the Conservation Commission and the Department of Health.

If you have questions about any of these recommendations, please consult your assigned OFM Budget Analyst, who will then coordinate assistance with the appropriate Results Team.

Finally, I want to thank all of you for your energy and dedication as we head into another round of POG. Your efforts are critical to its success, and I know from experience that I can count on you.

Attachment

cc: Agency Budget Director